



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/710,374		07/06/2004	Keiichi Miyajima	040316	4373	
23850	7590	03/21/2006		EXAMINER		
		RATZ, QUINTOS, 1	EVANS, JEFFERSON A			
1725 K STR	EET, NW	1		ART UNIT		
SUITE 1000	SUITE 1000				PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	WASHINGTON, DC 20006				2627	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/710,374	MIYAJIMA, KEIICHI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jefferson A. Evans	2652
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statue Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and subject to restriction and subject to restriction.	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 06 July 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the left.	a) accepted or b) objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail D	

Application/Control Number: 10/710,374

Art Unit: 2652

Claims 1 to 12 are pending.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tadepalli et al (U.S. 2002/0015255). Tadepalli discloses a disk drive with a rectifier plate 142 (note figure 2) that has a front edge curved to match the movement of a head which is rotated across a disk 122 bia a head actuator 112 (paragraph 0033). Shroud surface 158 is also disclosed. The corner between surfaces 158 and 160 will be a point of dust accumulation and can be considered a dust catcher. Tadepalli discloses multiple disk with the rectifier plate therebetween (figure 5 for example).

Application/Control Number: 10/710,374

Art Unit: 2652

4. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plonczak (U.S. 5,204,793). Plonczak discloses a disk drive including an integral head loading ramp and air filter as set forth in the title of the patent.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1 to 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 19 of copending Application No. 10/716,883. Looking at claim 1 of the present application and claim 12 of the '883' application, claim 12 of the '883' application does not set forth that the rectifier plate has an edge extending on an arc equidistant from an actuator support shaft. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Application/Control Number: 10/710,374

Art Unit: 2652

the invention was made to provide claim 12 of the '883' application with an edge extending on an arc equidistant from an actuator support shaft since the rectifier plate is going to effect airflow and having an edge with an arc matching the movement of the head slider will mean a consistent interface between air leaving the vicinity of the head slider and the rectifier plate.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 9 and 10 are allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 4 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and the double patenting type rejection were overcome.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jefferson A. Evans whose telephone number is 571-272-7574. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Thi Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jefferson A. Evans
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2652

3/19/06